

**Minutes
State Board of Education
June 27, 2005**

The State Board of Education held its regular meeting on June 27, 2005, at 1535 West Jefferson, Phoenix, Arizona 85007. The meeting was called to order at 9:05 AM.

Members Present

Dr. Matthew Diethelm, President
Ms. JoAnne Hilde, Vice President
Superintendent Tom Horne
Mr. Jesse Ary
Ms. Nadine Basha
Ms. Joanne Kramer
Ms. Anita Mendoza
Dr. Karen Nicodemus
Ms. Cecilia Owen
Dr. John Pedicone

Members Absent

Dr. Michael Crow

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- A. May 11, 2005 AIMS Study Session
- B. May 12, 2005 Standard Setting Meeting
- C. May 23, 2005 Regular Meeting
- D. May 23, 2005 Executive Session

Motion to approve all minutes as submitted by Ms. Basha and seconded by Ms. Kramer. *Motion passes.*

2. BUSINESS REPORTS

A. President's Report

Dr. Diethelm attended the NASBE study group on value added assessments, noting that the report from this group will be provided at the annual meeting to be held in Phoenix in October 2005. He added that the assessments are a very useful methodology to include in classifications and evaluations for schools/districts but the recommendation will probably be not to use this for teacher evaluation.

B. Superintendent's Report

Mr. Horne stated that the ADE staff has been extremely busy and offered congratulations to:

- Dr. Robert Franciosi and staff under Dr. Donna Lewis' leadership for providing approximately 25 training sessions on the state assessment system
- Ms. Marie Mancuso, with Ms. Phyllis Schwartz and the Reading First staff, presented the largest ADE conference with over 1500 participants
 - US Department of Education shared our state models and data
- Ms. Cheryl Lebo, under Ms. Phyllis Schwartz, presented the first ever AZ COUNTS conference in Tucson launching the statewide math initiative
- Ms. Tommy Meil, under Dr. Donna Lewis, facilitated the first turn-around principal training focused on school data
- Ms. Jan Amator, under Ms. Margaret Garcia Dugan, facilitated the first summer educational leadership institute as part of the Wallace Grant
- Dr. Rene Diaz, retired superintendent from Phoenix Union and Phoenix Elementary, who is the new Executive Director for the Wallace Leadership Initiative

- Social studies committee for their hard work
- Dr. Donna Lewis who is going to be the Assistant Superintendent in the Phoenix Elementary District
 - Dr. Diethelm added the State Board's best wishes and congratulations
- Dr. Tacy Ashby who will be the new Superintendent in the Cave Creek Unified School District
 - Dr. Diethelm added the State Board's best wishes and congratulations
- Ms. Margaret Garcia Dugan who will be the new Deputy Superintendent for the Arizona Department of Education

C. Board Member Reports

Ms. Basha conveyed that she and Dr. Diethelm attended an ABEC meeting that focused on high school reform, which will also be the topic of discussion at the WestEd meeting in July.

Dr. Pedicone stated that he had the opportunity to participate in the AZ READS conference in Tucson and that he appreciated the tone and quality of the conference. Dr. Pedicone thanked Tacy and Donna for a job well done.

Ms. Hilde attended NASBE's Government Affairs Committee, where about 15 states were represented and it was an eye-opening experience. Ms. Hilde encouraged all members to attend the annual meeting on October 13-15, 2005. Ms. Hilde added that nearly every state is going through the same kinds of pains that we are except Wyoming, where money is not an issue, according to their reports.

Ms. Kramer stated that she attended the Desert Canyon Institute and the Reading First Conference in Tucson which were both excellent.

D. Director's Report, Including Discussion Regarding Progress on Committee Appointments and Anticipated Schedule Relating to the Implementation Senate Bill 1038

Mr. Vince Yanez, Executive Director, Arizona State Board of Education, reiterated points from the study session and an update as follows:

- A task force will be doing most of the work and will begin meeting by next week
 - Board members will be notified regarding dates/times/locations of these meetings
- The courses that will count toward the augmentation are the 11½ credits required under Board rule for high school graduation
- Legislation allows up to 25% augmentation
 - The task force will be instructed that those students that earn an "A" will receive the full 25% augmentation and the rest of the formula for students receiving "B" and "C" will be set by the task force
 - A final recommendation is expected to be presented at the regular August 22nd Board meeting

Dr. Diethelm asked if there were tentative plans for a study session earlier in August and Mr. Yanez noted that there may be another meeting in July to report on what the recommendations will be from the task force. Mr. Yanez noted that a retreat is being scheduled and Ms. Owen is working on those details. Dr. Diethelm wants to be sure that the Board knows the recommendations of the task force and suggested that a preliminary meeting be held the first week in August.

Ms. Owen asked about the discussion on May 23rd regarding the superintendent's task force in relation to the sub-committee being discussed today. Mr. Yanez explained that the superintendent's task force is not the same group that will be working on the legislation but that some membership from the task force may serve on the sub-committee. He added that he is getting nominations from AEA, ASA, ASBA, and other educational organizations, in order to include a broad membership on the sub-committee.

Superintendent Horne noted that on this particular issue, there will only be the Board's sub-committee and any names that are referred to his office will be forwarded to Mr. Yanez. He added that the task force will be individuals that have been nominated from AEA, ASBA, etc. Dr. Diethelm suggested that members may refer names to Mr. Yanez for consideration as well. Ms. Owen stressed that the task force have representation outside of Maricopa County. Ms. Mendoza noted that the business community should also be represented on the committee and Dr. Diethelm suggested contacting ABEC and the Chamber of Commerce.

3. CONSENT ITEMS

A. Consideration to Approve Contract Abstracts

Ms. Owen recused herself from the following item: Item 3A, 2, 4 and 5. Dr. Nicodemus recused herself from Item 3A and abstained from voting on this item.

Motion to approve the Consent Agenda Items by Dr. Pedicone and seconded by Ms. Hilde.

Motion passes with the exceptions noted above with a vote of 8 to zero.

B. Presentation and Discussion of U.S. Department of Education's Recommendations Regarding Arizona's Highly Qualified Teachers' Attestation and Arizona's Highly Objective, Uniform, State Standard of Evaluation (HOUSSE) Rubric

C. Consideration to Approve Academic Contest Funds Pursuant to A.R.S. 15-1241 and A.A.C. R7-2-313.

D. Consideration to Approve Federal Grant for the Advanced Placement Incentive Program, Pursuant to A.R.S. 15-206 and A.R.S. 15-207

E. Consideration to Approve Proposals for Training Programs Relating to Provisional Structured English Immersion Endorsements

F. Consideration to Approve Proposals for Training Programs Relating to Full Structured English Immersion Endorsements

G. Consideration to Accept the Automatic and Permanent Revocation, Pursuant to A.R.S. §15-550, of the Following Certification Cases:

1. Michael Sean Dougherty

2. Kathoum Majeed Mutab

H. Consideration to Accept the Recommendations of the Professional Practices Advisory Committee and Approve Certification for the Following Individuals:

1. Kelly Shunk

2. Eric Emerson

4. CALL TO THE PUBLIC

There were no requests from the public to speak at this time.

5. GENERAL SESSION

A. Presentation, Discussion and Consideration to Approve the Recommendation of the Professional Practice Advisory Committee in the Matter of the State Board of Education v. Brian Bell, Case No. C-2003-031

Ms. Lisette Flores, Chief Investigator, Investigative Unit, Arizona State Board of Education, presented background information as provided in the materials packet.

Motion by Ms. Hilde to approve the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law of the Professional Practices Advisory Committee as presented. Seconded by Ms. Basha. *Motion passes. Dr. Pedicone voted no.*

Motion by Dr. Nicodemus that Mr. Bell's teaching certificate be suspended for a minimum of one year. Prior to reinstatement Mr. Bell shall be required to receive counseling, at his own expense, from a licensed professional whose expertise is in anger management. This individual will assess and determine Mr. Bell's ability to return to the classroom. Mr. Bell will further be

required to reappear before the PPAC and the Board to establish his fitness to teach prior to reinstatement of his certificate. Seconded by Dr. Pedicone. *Motion passes.*

- B. Presentation, Discussion and Consideration to Approve Request to Assume Accounting Responsibility, Pursuant to A.R.S. 15-914.01, for the Lake Havasu Unified School District—**REMOVED FROM AGENDA.**

- C. Presentation and Discussion of Proposed Interagency Service Agreement Regarding the Completion of Future Education Related Research.

Dr. Diethelm noted that the purpose of this study is to provide the advantage of research from Arizona Education Policy Initiative (AEPI) as well as from other organizations. Dr. Diethelm added that Dr. Garcia should make sure he is closely tied to the Department IT staff and the supervisory staff in order to facilitate the data.

Dr. David Garcia, Assistant Professor, Arizona State University, noted that they are prepared to work with the Department in transporting data and facilitating the transfer effects data. Dr. Garcia noted that AEPI can provide quality research in a timely manner and can contribute to alleviating the void of information that the Board needs to assist in decision making. Dr. Garcia proposes to leverage the collective expertise housed in Arizona's universities through the collaboration of Arizona State University, The University of Arizona and Northern Arizona University. In addition, he noted that AEPI will provide help with the detailed requirements in Senate Bill 1038.

Dr. Garcia proposed a long-term partnership, which if executed well, would put the State Board in a proactive stance toward shaping education policy in the future. Dr. Garcia presented an outline of the principles of an Interservice Agreement between AEPI and the State Board of Education. Please see the document provided in the materials packet.

Dr. Garcia cited three successful models in other states for this kind of agreement:

- California's Policy Analysis for California Education (PACE)
 - Aspirational peer
 - Conducts long-term, longitudinal evaluations that take several years to complete on initiatives that don't happen in a short time
 - Hold seminars of policy-makers with academic experts and they broker information from available data and leverage other data sets
- North Carolina Education Research Data Center
 - Center was established in 2000-2001
 - Data is available to those who submit a proposal to use the data for policy research purposes
- Consortium on Chicago School
 - In the heart of Chicago politics and takes a pluralistic approach toward policy
 - Transparent focus is to have all data ready for study by stakeholders
 - Well respected organization for quality research in a very politically charged environment

Dr. Garcia made the following additional points:

- They are not asking for any funding but will find funding
- They are asking for the Department to share data to do quality research
- They are concerned with student confidentiality and privacy
 - Will not transport any data until the State Board and Arizona State University are comfortable with the data transmission and security plan
- There will be an oversight board consisting of
 - Members of the State Board
 - Deans from the Arizona Colleges of Education
 - Community members

- The oversight board will have public discussions about what is research and the methods by which we go forward
 - Need transparency in the type of questions to be asked and how those questions are answered

Mr. Horne stated that he appreciates the research that has been done and the ten-state study and added that the Department will be cooperative in providing data but the details need to be worked out as to what data is provided. He added that traditionally the Department does not release data on a carte blanche basis to anyone and asked the Assistant Attorney General to comment regarding requiring the release of data.

Ms. Nancy Oyen, Assistant Attorney General, stated that the Board has a mandate to provide policy and under that policy the Superintendent is directed to carry out the policy. She added that at this point in time there is not policy directly related to this issue but there is an outstanding question regarding who controls what. Ms. Oyen noted that the Superintendent will discuss the release of data on a case-by-case basis.

Dr. Pedicone asked if the Board would need to create a policy and Mr. Yanez stated that the Board does not have a policy regarding this research or in conjunction to this it does not have a policy to provide data to any outside agency for that research. Dr. Pedicone noted his concern regarding who owns the data and Dr. Garcia noted that they would not own the data but would only have a copy to manage, maintain and use in preparing reports.

Dr. Diethelm explained that in terms of existing policy, the Board requests this kind of study and the Department is the implementing agency per the Board's direction. He added that Dr. Garcia's proposal under the direction of its oversight committee is a separate agency for requesting research.

Ms. Oyen explained that there is not statutory authority since there is not a policy and it is unclear whether that authority can be delegated to another board via policy.

Dr. Nicodemus stated her concern about giving data to another oversight board.

Ms. Owen asked Dr. Garcia if he has models/examples and Dr. Garcia cited other models such as North Carolina where the data is available. He explained that in terms of an oversight board, research projects for the State Board would be the oversight board's priority.

Ms. Hilde stated that she is excited about the possibilities and that she believes the Board needs to draft a policy and hopefully have it prepared by the August 2005 meeting.

Mr. Ary stated that he was under the impression that the Department is the official custodian of data and asked if data would ever be inconsistent with the Department's data. Dr. Garcia assured that this would not happen but the data would be available for further study by other entities in an effort to improve education in Arizona.

Dr. Nicodemus commented that if policy states that the State Board has oversight nothing could prevent it from sharing data. She noted her bias from the community college perspective and cited that sometimes well-intentioned research may have unintended consequences.

Ms. Owen asked how WestEd may or may not be involved and Dr. Garcia stated that he does not have a direct idea of how WestEd may be involved. He added that WestEd handles other states besides Arizona and this data is going to be used by and for Arizona only. He noted that there is plenty of room for research on national issues but that there are no funds available for national projects as yet.

Dr. Diethelm suggested that this issue be on the August or September agenda and members will discuss what the data is and the possible alternatives.

Superintendent Horne stated that if carte blanche is given then the Department will no longer be the custodian of the data. He added that the Department will always be cooperative in providing data on a study-by-study basis.

Ms. Basha stated that she would be interested if Dr. Garcia could give more details as to how this

works in three other states where the state is custodian of the data. Dr. Garcia stated that he will forward the open agreement between North Carolina and its Department of Education which shows that once the state has completed its purpose for data, they hand it over to the consortium. Ms. Basha discussed past experiences with WestEd where they have assisted in research at no charge and noted that WestEd was limited in what it could do under the agreement.

Dr. Nicodemus asked if the Department has ever pursued a study with an outside consortium and then be in a position to share that information/data if requested to do so.

Ms. Oyen stated that there is no process and no jurisdiction at this time to give carte blanche.

Ms. Ruth Solomon, Associate Superintendent for Education Policy, Arizona Department of Education, noted that the Department has a number of partnerships/agreements in place with the university and that the Department is always anxious to create new partnerships.

Dr. Diethelm reiterated that the Board seems to be thrilled that Dr. Garcia is willing to do this research, but the Board seems to not be thrilled about delegating the approval authority for particular research groups outside this agency. Superintendent Horne noted that if data is needed, they should talk to him about it and Dr. Garcia added that sometimes you don't know what you need until you have worked with the data for a while. Dr. Garcia suggested beginning with data from 1997-2000, link it and see what's there. He suggested that data from a school district could then be added and if a request must be made through the State Board each time new data is needed in the study, the Board will again be behind. He explained that the purpose is to get the data, work with it and then bring information to the State Board along the way. Superintendent Horne argued that the research desire should first be determined and then the data needed can be worked out; but that there is no jurisdiction for giving cold carte blanche access. He also pointed out that there are people at the university with political agendas and that he didn't think it is lawful for other groups to have full, unlimited access to go fishing for data.

Dr. Pedicone asked if this might have an unwanted potential and suggested that they might look at some discreet data through a relationship on a limited basis.

Ms. Oyen advised that anything done along these lines should include the Superintendent in making access decisions.

Dr. Nicodemus commented that the release of data should be with a clear agreement of the kind of research the Board has interest in.

Mr. Ary noted his concern about school dropout issues and wondered who is custodian of this data. Dr. Garcia stated that the Department/district is the custodian and will continue to be the custodian.

Ms. Hilde commented that in drafting a policy to address these questions the Board's concerns could be addressed in the policy.

Ms. Owen stated that she would like to see more from data, agrees with Dr. Garcia, and believes there are other resources at the universities that can analyze the data from other perspectives which would be helpful in the Board's decision making.

Ms. Janice Palmer, Director, Governmental Relations, Arizona School Boards Association, addressed the State Board with their perspective regarding the role of the Board. She noted that a concern of ASBA is the fact that the Legislature makes a decision and charges the State Board with implementing the decision without allowing sufficient time for the task to be completed as in SB 1038. She noted that because of time constraints, the Board must operate under its best guess and the Board needs some kind of body it can go to in order to access this information to make decisions with confidence.

Ms. Mendoza asked how much of this is public information and Dr. Garcia stated that much of the information would not be public information. He cited an example—relationship between courses, grades and AIMS scores.

Dr. Diethelm stated that this issue should be revisited in August or September and should include discussion about policy alternatives.

D. Update Regarding the Wallace Foundation State Action for Education Leadership Project II (SAELP II)

Ms. Jan Amator, Deputy Associate Superintendent for Highly Qualified Professionals, Arizona Department of Education, presented the highlights and background information provided in the materials packet. Ms. Amator noted that a full presentation will be given to the State Board at the August 2005 meeting.

E. Presentation and Discussion Regarding Arizona Program Standards for Beginning Teacher Induction

Ms. Jan Amator, Deputy Associate Superintendent for Highly Qualified Professionals, Arizona Department of Education, presented the background information as provided in the materials packet. Ms. Amator highlighted the eight standards as delineated in the overview.

Dr. Nicodemus asked about the process of placing this into rule and Ms. Amator noted that the committee wanted permission to put this into Board rule as a guideline for consistency throughout the state. She added that if statewide mentoring is funded the standards would already be in place.

Ms. Mendoza observed that it is difficult to see mandating a format when schools can write their own needs.

Ms. Owen noted that the framework provided a plan for all agencies to look at and stated that universities could do research on this piece. Ms. Owen stated that this is an area where charter schools could be assisted.

Superintendent Horne noted that this package was submitted to the Legislature for \$15M and indicated that induction and mentoring would most directly affect student achievement.

However, he added that this was not funded so this item will come to the top of the priority list for this coming year as these standards are a good step toward getting the funding.

Ms. Hilde asked how we put these into rule as guiding principles until a funding mechanism is available.

Dr. Diethelm suggested that this item be included in the consent agenda as guidelines at the next meeting. In addition, he suggested that this be translated into rule as soon as there is a budget.

Ms. Basha noted her approval of the concept of teacher induction and asked what the barriers were at the Legislature.

Superintendent Horne responded that it was a matter of priority and other items were funded first.

F. Presentation and Discussion Regarding Request for Proposal For the Performance Assessment Portion of the Arizona Teacher Proficiency Assessment

Ms. Jan Amator, Deputy Associate Superintendent for Highly Qualified Professionals, Arizona Department of Education, presented the background information as provided in the materials packet. Please see the PowerPoint presentation which is included in the materials packet and outlines the entire program as presented. In addition, Ms. Amator presented the Performance Assessment Timeline, Certificate Conversion Chart, and Professional Licenses information which are also included in the materials packet.

Ms. Amator stated that the recommendation from staff is to approve performance assessment and to accept the recommendation of the RFP Review Committee and the option presented by the ADE staff.

Mr. Andrew Morrill, Vice President, Arizona Education Association, spoke in support of the performance assessment:

- It will enhance teacher quality
- There will be an earlier concentration on those processes that lead to better teaching faster
- Will lead to greater retention

- AEA is ready to accept the challenge of keeping the standards of quality teaching high

Dr. Diethelm stated that he believes the state should share the financial burden and thanked everyone for all their work.

Ms. Hilde said that she is secure that our teacher preparation programs are fully prepared to be partners as they send their teachers out for this process. She added that the evolution of this process has been remarkable to watch.

Motion by Ms. Hilde to adopt the performance assessment as presented and accept the recommendation of the RFP Review Committee as follows:

Option B: The State Board adopts the performance assessment portion of the Arizona Teacher Proficiency Assessment and accepts the recommendation of the RFP Review Committee.

As outlined in the timeline listed in the proposal response,

- Performance assessment materials will be available for teachers by February, 2006
- The first assessment portfolios are due March 31, 2007
- The first scores will be available no later than December 31, 2007

Because of these timelines, any teacher needing to convert a provisional certificate to a standard certificate in 2006 will be grandfathered in under the existing arrangement. The existing rule language makes provision for teachers who do not pass the performance assessment on the first attempt.

Seconded by Ms. Basha and she added that this is a great advancement that teachers can grow from. Dr. Nicodemus asked if this is the missing piece from a national perspective. Ms. Amator responded that there are not many states doing performance assessment right now but they are watching Arizona's process as we are looking at the national board for that one entry. She added that we will set an appropriate cut score for standard teaching so other states will have the advantage of watching Arizona's system.

Dr. Nicodemus noted that we would be far better to invest in the induction process than to be charging teachers \$400 through which they can receive this test. Dr. Nicodemus added that she sees the value of the assessment but noted that the Board will have the responsibility to set the cut scores. Dr. Pedicone noted his concern regarding the need to align the continuing teacher status process with this and that agencies and districts should work together. He also agreed that the state needs to support offsetting the cost to teachers.

Mr. Ary stated that he feels this is a very timely need as our teachers need to be equipped and be the best that we can get. He added that the costs may need to be a state responsibility and noted that the motion does not take action on where the financial responsibility lies and wondered if there should be an amendment to the motion.

Dr. Diethelm clarified that the recommendation specifies that the \$395 cost is the responsibility of the teacher and in terms of subsidizing that cost or teacher development prior to the test, this is not included in the motion. Dr. Diethelm added that this question should be addressed by the Governor and Legislature.

Ms. Mendoza asked if the fee must be paid again if the test has to be retaken and Ms Amator responded that the fee has to be paid each time the test is taken.

Ms. Mendoza noted her concern as to how this dove-tails with the teacher evaluation process at the site.

Ms. Kramer mentioned another aspect regarding the financial burden on new teachers as they always spend lots of personal money setting up their classroom. She added that she is in support of efforts to elevate our profession and asked if this applies toward national board certification. Ms. Amator responded that teachers can bank their score for up to three years.

Dr. Nicodemus asked if this test will be scored on the basis of what would be expected of a beginning teacher or minimal expectations for a teacher receiving a standard certificate. Ms. Amator responded that it is set up to score in four levels.

Ms. Owen asked if there was a way to have this provisional piece embedded in new teacher induction as a guideline as there may be situations where new teachers are in a building with nothing in place to support them. Ms. Amator responded that they expect this to be an overlap and that one support they are putting forward is a pre-candidate class to assist teachers in preparing for the tests. *Motion passes.*

G. Presentation, Discussion and Consideration to Extend ISA With the State Board for Charter Schools

Mr. Yanez presented background information as provided in the materials packet, noting that the ISA has lapsed and today's item is an extension of the original agreement. Mr. Yanez pointed out that the Board is no longer required to enter into this ISA but since the State Board no longer maintains staff to provide oversight to charter schools this agreement is recommended.

Motion by Dr. Pedicone to extend the Interagency Service Agreement with the State Board for Charter Schools as presented. Seconded by Ms. Hilde. *Motion passes.*

H. Presentation, Discussion and Consideration to Purchase AIMS Tutoring Guides
Ms. Margaret Garcia Dugan, Associate Superintendent of Academic Achievement, Arizona Department of Education, presented background information as provided in the materials packet. Ms. Garcia Dugan noted that the Study Guides offer equity to all students and would be a starting place for students who need remediation help. A sample study guide was also provided for members.

Ms. Hilde asked how the study guide will address the student who has inadequate knowledge of English when they take the test. She noted that during the standard setting process it was obvious that a writing test was taken by a student without enough English to do well on the assignment.

Ms. Garcia stated that the guide breaks down the writing process as far as the rubric organization of the vocabulary growth sentence structure. She added that the student's teacher would know if the student was an English Language Learner and would be able to tell from the writing sample what problems may exist in writing.

Ms. Owen asked what the school receives and Ms. Tesha Pryor, Grow Network, a Division of CTB McGraw-Hill, responded that the school will receive the comprehensive guide for teachers and professional development for teachers and school leaders. She added that the materials will be available in written form and online.

Ms. Owen asked to see a sample and Ms. Pryor referred to the Texas website and materials from the previous Board meeting which included a sample student profile.

Mr. Ary asked if there is a way to directly expect those students who are known to be in a failing status to utilize the study guides and Ms. Garcia Dugan responded that every student will receive a study guide and teachers and parents will be given information as well.

Mr. Ary asked whether the study guides will be in Spanish and Ms. Pryor responded that translation would be provided for parent workshops but full Spanish study guides have not been included in this proposal.

Ms. Owen wondered if a school district has its own tutoring program planned whether there is a way they can propose for some funding and Mr. Horne replied that there is \$10M available for next year, but this is a proposal for money that would otherwise revert.

Dr. Pedicone asked if schools will be able to access individual student's scores and needs via the website and Ms. Pryor responded that schools would not have access to the student's data. Dr. Pedicone noted that access to this information would be a helpful tool and asked for a report on how this could be done. Ms. Pryor noted that the professional development is very targeted and very custom. She added that they are aware of the public interest around AIMS and are working to generate larger public support and parental understanding. She explained that they will do the following for parents around the state:

- Make them aware of the resources coming for their children
- Help them understand what they can do at home with the study guide
- Make them aware of the other resources that are available, i.e. tutoring initiative

Ms. Hilde asked how we will track distribution use and the effectiveness of the study guides because the contract is written to obligate us for additional years of study guides. Ms. Garcia Dugan responded that each student will receive a study guide and the next presentation will show whether the tutoring helped.

Ms. Owen requested data from other states that have been using tutoring guides and Ms. Pryor noted that they have data from Texas Education Agency which shows an increase in passing from 72% before the study guides were used to 85% after the study guides were used. She added that educators in Texas are acknowledging that the study guides had an impact on these results. Motion by Ms. Hilde to approve the purchase of personalized AIMS Tutoring Guides from the Grow Network as presented. Seconded by Ms. Kramer. *Motion passes.* It was clarified that this motion is to approve funding for this year only.

I. Presentation and Discussion Regarding the Implementation Plan for the Failing Schools Tutoring Fund

Ms. Nancy Konitzer, Deputy Associate Superintendent, Academic Achievement Division, Arizona Department of Education, presented background information as provided in the materials packet. Ms. Konitzer outlined some of the following changes/requirements that will need to be addressed pursuant to statute changes:

- New methods for parents to apply for tutoring
- New recommendations on how to determine the value of a particular certificate that is based on a market survey that the Board is required to implement
- Determine how students will avail themselves of these services which will include the high school students that did not pass AIMS
- Determine whether or not students should have training and if so what that training should be
- Criteria for tutoring providers
- Requirements of providers, i.e. guarantee, reimbursement policies, etc.

Ms. Konitzer stated that they are hoping to bring an implementation plan to the State Board in August.

Ms. Garcia Dugan noted that the Task Force will look for opportunities where students can avail themselves of these services.

J. Presentation and Discussion Relating to House Bill 2417. Discussion May Include, But is Not Limited to, Board Procedures for the Consideration of Whether to Appoint a Receiver for a School District

Mr. Chad Sampson, Assistant Attorney General, presented HB 2417 focusing on two aspects that will be of concern to the State Board which is contained in the materials provided in the packet:

- The bill makes the State Board a trier-of-fact with regard to school district mismanagement of funds and insolvency and is required to review allegations of insolvency and gross mismanagement of finances
 - A review will take place in a public meeting
 - The district will have the opportunity to present to the Board but it would not be a full Board hearing
 - The Attorney General's Office will bring complaint on behalf of the State Board
 - The AG's office has the burden of proof and it is the Board's responsibility to determine whether the burden of proof has been met

- If the Board determines the district is insolvent or has grossly mismanaged its funds, the school district shall be placed in receivership and the Board shall appoint a receiver for the district
- The State Board is required to adopt a list of qualified receivers
- Once a receiver for a school district has been approved that receiver will perform an investigation and report after 120 days and establish a financial improvement plan, a budget and a timeline for the State Board's approval
- The receiver is required to give quarterly progress reports
- The State Board is required to have a formal review of this process every six months
- When the receiver has completed their job, the State Board must determine whether to move the district out of receivership

Dr. Diethelm asked if the school has the option of appealing for a formal hearing and Mr. Sampson responded that the AG's office will assure formal due process and that this Board is exempt from the Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH).

Ms. Hilde asked who can make allegations and Mr. Sampson replied that anyone can make allegations and that the AG's office will bring the allegations on behalf of the State Board because of specific language in 103 (D). Mr. Sampson added that Superintendent Horne has asked the Attorney General's Office to look into one specific school district and that anyone is allowed to do this.

Ms. Hilde asked if a disgruntled parent called and made an allegation whether the AG's office would investigate and Mr. Sampson answered yes. Ms. Oyen added that this happens every day. Ms. Mendoza inquired regarding delinquent debt and Mr. Sampson explained that the law is very specific and is meant for districts that are grossly mismanaging finances or they are insolvent and cannot pay their debts on time. Mr. Sampson added that since there was no bankruptcy provision for school districts this law was put into effect.

Ms. Owen asked whether the duties and responsibilities of a county superintendent could qualify a county superintendent's office to be a receiver and Ms. Oyen responded that those qualifications have not yet been determined.

Mr. Horne noted that the Department has had conversations with the AG's Office about some likely people they might recommend as receivers and one consideration was a county superintendent. He added that the RFP process has been started and a list of possible receivers will be forwarded to the State Board as per statute, so the Board could approve a receiver for Colorado City if it is found that Colorado City needs a receiver.

Ms. Basha asked if it was the State Board's responsibility to do the RFP and generate the list and Mr. Horne responded that the answer is yes but they had to get it started. Ms. Basha asked Ms. Oyen about the validity of this and Ms. Oyen stated that it is the State Board's responsibility and that Mr. Horne will give the State Board what he has done so far.

Ms. Basha then asked who will oversee this and where will the resources come from and Dr. Nicodemus commented that if a district is insolvent and new administration must be hired, there would be some additional moneys needed at the outset. Mr. Sampson noted that this will be taken under advisement and they will provide as much resources as possible to bring the case to bear.

Ms. Basha asked if there was a way to allocate resources to this body for this task and Mr. Sampson responded that this will be taken under advisement.

Ms. Owen asked if county boards of supervisors could be considered as being responsible for funding? Mr. Horne responded that the district has to pay for the receiver per statute. Mr. Sampson added that the bill does not give the jurisdiction to charge the county superintendent for a district's wrongdoing but the bill does give the jurisdiction to look at a specific school district.

He added that if the county superintendent's office is found to be responsible, the district would not be punished.

Ms. Hilde asked if the State Board could put out an RFP or RFQ if this is not effective until August 12, and Ms. Oyen was asked to see if the State Board has this authority.

Dr. Nicodemus clarified whether the receiver can override the local district governing board's decision and whether the receiver serves at the pleasure of the State Board. She also noted that the State Board must be careful not to give blanket powers to the receiver. Mr. Horne noted that he didn't think the Legislature contemplated the State Board being as involved as a school board is but that the receiver would exercise the day-to-day functions.

Mr. Sampson noted that the governing board and the school district will continue to function and that this is meant to look like a trustee in a bankruptcy case for a corporation.

K. Presentation and Discussion Regarding Proposed Exempt Rulemaking Process to be Utilized by the Board After August 12, 2005

Mr. Yanez reminded members that the exemption for rulemaking takes effect August 12, 2005 and briefly explained the process as follows:

- Much more streamlined
- Requires two opportunities for public comment
 - Proposed rules are presented to the Board in written form and an opportunity for public comment is provided at the meeting
 - At that time the Board will provide notice for a second opportunity for public comment which can be written or at another public hearing
 - This meeting will be conducted by staff where Board members do not need to be present
- State Board can establish emergency rules by providing two quick opportunities for public comment and adopt rules in an emergency provision
- To ensure that the public has access to all rules this policy requires the Board to continue to publish its rules with the Secretary of State's Office

Dr. Diethelm noted that Board members are encouraged to participate in this process.

L. Presentation, Discussion and Consideration to Approve Proposed Social Studies Standards Articulated by Grade Level

NOTE: This Item was the first topic discussed in the general session.

Ms. Phyllis Schwartz, Associate Superintendent, School Effectiveness Division, Arizona Department of Education, noted that they were here to present the final draft document of the revised Social Studies Standards for the State Board's approval. Assisting in the presentation were Ms. Marie Mancuso, Deputy Associate Superintendent, Standards Based Teaching and Learning, School Effectiveness Division, Arizona Department of Education, Ms. Cheryl Lebo, Deputy Associate Superintendent of Best Practices, Arizona Department of Education, Ms. Carol Warren, Social Studies Content Specialist, School Effectiveness Division, Arizona Department of Education, and Ms. Lacey Wieser, Education Program Specialist (Science), Arizona Department of Education. Ms. Schwartz added that teachers from the Social Studies committee were also present as well as others who worked on this project.

Ms. Schwartz presented the background information as provided in the materials packet and recognized members of the task force who were present at today's meeting.

Ms. Mancuso gave a brief overview of the standards development process which were used for all standards:

- Committee members selected
- Candidates nominated and selection criteria set
- Available resources for the committee identified
- Development process is approximately one year and then the feedback process begins

- Public input is sought
- Committee returns and evaluates feedback
- Committee can revise and modify, delete or eliminate a concept and or they can choose after discussion to keep a concept
- The committee fine-tunes
- Presentation to the State Board for approval
- Dissemination to the districts

Please see the PowerPoint presentation for complete information. Ms. Warren discussed the Social Studies articulation committee, the framework, etc., as per the PowerPoint presentation.

Members of the committee addressed the State Board:

Mr. David Williams, Tucson USD, served on the high school committee and endorses and supports the new standards. He noted that spiraling is extremely important and that one-third of his students did not start in his district. He added that American history is currently split between middle school and high school and that this would benefit transient students who would more likely receive a complete education. Mr. Williams commended the ADE leadership in that the comments were next to the PO's making effective use of the committee's time and that public comments were addressed thoroughly and completely.

Ms. Gina Nuñez, Cartwright School District, who served on the middle school committee, discussed the process utilized by the committee, noting her pride in being on the committee and hoping it will be put into action.

Ms. Flora Sombrero, Tuba City Public Schools, served on the middle school committee and noted the open mindedness of the group. Ms. Sombrero endorsed the standards presented to the Board today.

Ms. Mancuso discussed the Department's plan for support and assistance to schools in the implementation of the Social Studies Standards, which is also included in the PowerPoint presentation provided in the materials packet. Ms. Mancuso pointed out that we need to pay attention to domain knowledge (fluency, vocabulary and comprehension). She noted that currently narrative information is introduced in primary and an exposure to social studies and science concepts enhance and build comprehension. In addition, Ms. Mancuso stated that students in the primary grades are engaged in enriched content.

Ms. Lebo outlined the school effectiveness plan in Cross-Curricular Connections, which is also outlined in the PowerPoint presentation. She noted that training and Expos are being planned and guidance documentation is being created.

Ms. Wieser discussed making a searchable database available through IDEAL. She showed a sample, Literature Connections to the Academic Standards, and noted the search results. Ms. Wieser then demonstrated a website called Enter Trade Books into the Reference Library Database.

Ms. Mancuso summarized that the revised standards will move our students closer to the vision and they will be prepared to function as informed individuals.

Ms. Diane Laufenberg, Teacher, Mt. Elden Middle School, Flagstaff, Arizona, expressed concern regarding the social studies document with respect to the distribution of concepts across grade levels. She stated that she is struck by the enormity of the performance objectives and that she is extremely concerned that this document will set up our students and teachers for failure.

Ms. Laufenberg stated that she would like the Board to postpone their decision today and carefully think of what they are asking of teachers and students. She asked for model curriculum maps that address the reality of what is going on in schools today and a plan for funding as schools do not have the resources to teach the standards that are being proposed.

Mr. Chris Brandt, Arizona Educational Representatives Association, AERA, addressed the State Board as a representative of the publishers. He noted that the publishers go by the national

standards and that they wanted to alert the Board that 50 of the 80 members of AERA are concerned that the rest of the nation has not caught up and that there could be gaps in the materials they can provide, particularly in the world history aspect.

Ms. Mancuso stated that in reference to core knowledge, they look at standards and existing resources and the core knowledge curriculum was one resource that was used. Ms. Mancuso noted that the reason they looked at core knowledge is because it is one of two curricula that address world history in the primary grades. Ms. Mancuso emphasized that this is not a core knowledge curriculum because in doing a crosswalk between core knowledge and our social studies standards you would find some similarities and some differences.

Ms. Warren assured the Board that the standards present ten broad strands, which are addressed in the new standards presented today.

Discussion ensued with comments/questions from members including the following:

Mr. Ary:

- Was Ms. Laufenberg invited to be a member of the committee and would she have accepted if asked? Ms. Laufenberg stated that she was not aware but became aware in December after the process was started. She added that regarding the 20 percent, there are 12 people identified as working at core knowledge schools and that it is actually 21.4 percent.

Dr. Nicodemus:

- Complimented the presentation and asked what it means to have standards applied in the school system? Ms. Mancuso responded that there is no monitoring and checking other than a declaration that district school boards and administrators sign. The declaration asks for alignment of reading, math and writing standards.
- What expectation would be for a school to align itself to the standards? Ms. Mancuso responded that schools would have a year to transition and to address how they are going to integrate the new set of standards, which will take some professional development. Superintendent Horne stated that the ADE is working hard to develop standards and the first step was demonstrated by Ms. Wieser.

Ms. Kramer:

- Appreciates the integration piece and the professional development noting that teachers will gladly do it but they need the resources.

Ms. Mendoza:

- Loves social studies but her issue with the process is that she wants all the teachers to go through the process. Ms. Mendoza stated that she thinks this seems more like a curriculum than a set of standards, adding that in the math and reading standards we are working more on the acquisition of skills. She added that the list seems a bit market driven and that it is being presented in a prescriptive attitude.

Dr. Pedicone:

- Committees require great courage
- Concerns about the eurocentric views and textbooks that will be chosen
- What kind of instruction and support will be given to school districts and teachers
- Staff has helped answer a lot of his questions
- Is there a minority report about groups that didn't agree
- Training and funding are a major concern

Ms. Mancuso stated that there is not a minority report. Ms. Warren stated that about 75% of the committee returned a support document and that out of that 75%, 100% supported the document. Superintendent Horne stated that there is not a minority report because a long time was spent discussing the issues.

Ms. Basha:

- Congratulated the group for their dedication
- Pleased with the amount of feedback given
- In Arizona one out of five kids lives in poverty and they do not have access to the Internet and domain knowledge
- Hasn't heard anything about what materials are available

Ms. Lebo stated that they need to go further in order to help students broaden their horizons and that when she was teaching, her students loved it. Ms. Basha concurred with Ms. Lebo but added that we must be realistic in figuring out how this will happen.

- Concerned with how this will become interpreted at a district level
- Not sure how this happens for young children
- Feels that we need to figure out how we can work this realistically

Ms. Mancuso believes that it can be done and that it will help with the reading domain.

Ms. Owen:

- Thanked the committee
- Concerned about the makeup of the committee as there was not representation from Coconino County with the exception of Flora Sombrero.
- Believes the committee is very Maricopa-centric
- Thought there was low participation in some committee meetings
- Suggested adding some smaller regional groups
- Has reservations about the developmental and age appropriateness and the cultural sensitivity
- Thought the performance objectives are prescriptive
- Concerned about:
 - the "Eurocentric-ness"
 - lack of outreach across the state
 - time
 - difficulty involved to view the public comments
- Favors postponing the adoption and looking at curriculum mapping
- Attendance on these committees is down because teachers have a very heavy work load at this time of year

Ms. Hilde:

- Is greatly impressed by the process and is a strong believer in the importance of the process
- Concern in developing new curriculum and setting new standards
- Content concerns:
 - Doesn't understand why we introduce the Native Americans of the Northwest before we introduce Native Americans of Arizona
 - Can't understand how we talk about the development of the West through people coming from the South and North of us
- Could not envision how all of these materials could be covered in sixth grade
- We need to look at a two year implementation
- School district budgets are already planned for the next school year
- Would agree to delay approval and utilize the two-year implementation plan with a trainer-of-trainer model

Superintendent Horne:

- Students that were in core knowledge curriculum in the late 90's are now entering high school with sufficient background information that their teachers can teach in greater

depth

- Analysis also shows that these students do better in reading tests

Dr. Diethelm congratulated the Department on the process and amount of work and noted that opportunities for improvement could include the following general areas:

- Implementation
 - Guidelines for how to integrate the curriculum
 - Mapping
 - How to gather the resources to implement the standards
 - How to factor the standards into the school day
 - Documented in sample lesson plans
 - How to specify and teach comprehension rather than memorization
 - Timeline for implementation
- Total State Buy-In
 - Another round of statewide reviews?
- Content
 - Correlation of children's development with age and content
 - Cultural sensitivities
 - Maybe more Arizona slant?
- Consider delaying approval

Further discussion ensued and included the following points:

- Inclusion and participation issues and how the Department might use different ideas to make sure there is representation from each county
 - More people should be involved
 - Was everybody invited to every meeting
- Concern with the implementation process
 - Are teachers in a position to teach what is required
 - What will be conveyed to teachers regarding their flexibility in teaching the materials
- Give the Department time to respond to the feedback provided by the State Board
- Utilize first-class mail for meeting notifications in addition to emails and posting on the web site

Ms. Mancuso stated that some of the meetings were small, i.e., for K-3 or high school only, but if some meetings had a small attendance, they made calls. Ms. Mancuso added that recruitment is a challenge and that the time commitment is difficult for some people. She noted that an application is available on the ADE website to submit a name for participation. Regarding the issues of "specificity" and "prescriptiveness", Ms. Mancuso stated that the concept level is the key to understanding.

Superintendent Horne asked the Board to consider a two-year implementation, subject to the Department demonstrating implementation and revisions that take place over the next year which is an acceptance of the work done to date by the committee.

Dr. Pedicone noted that it is key to have the right people and that individuals need to be invited specifically. He added that he doesn't think the Board is ready.

Ms. Mendoza noted that this is a value-laden concept and expressed her concern regarding a textbook company's claim that it writes its textbooks based on a state's curriculum.

Ms. Hilde noted that the social studies test will be given in 2008 and this relates to the prescriptive issue.

Dr. Nicodemus stated it is important to balance all the ideas around the table and recognize the work done by the committee.

Ms. Owen stated that she believes that with a broader participation level most school districts

will come along but there are still things about shortages of substitute teachers, lack of travel money, money being shifted into professional development in essential areas that limit many district's abilities to participate in overnight trips.

Motion by Ms. Hilde that the Social Studies Standards be approved with the awareness of necessary changes as discussed during this Board meeting and that a two-year implementation plan be presented to the Board at the September 2005 meeting. Seconded by Mr. Horne.

Dr. Pedicone suggested that the matter be tabled for one Board meeting pending the addressing of the major concepts heard today as we are not ready to have a plan in place. Mr. Horne noted that the Department will present a proposal which includes all the comments made by the Board and will be subject to revision and that with a two-year process a full year would be available for revisions to be made. Ms. Hilde stated that we all respect the process and that she hoped it will not be perceived as a lack of confidence in the process nor the participants in that process if the motion is to table. She added that the Board has a legitimate responsibility to ask questions that were raised today and asked Mr. Yanez about the rulemaking process. Mr. Yanez responded that if standards are approved the rulemaking process is not necessary as these are not rules.

Dr. Pedicone asked if tabling this would create a major problem in the implementation process and Ms. Schwartz responded that they hope the Board will value the work of the committee and approve the standards. Ms. Schwartz added that a postponement would put the Department in a position to evaluate who would be able to continue to assist from the current committee. Ms. Schwartz added that if more people are going to be involved in the process then September 2005 is a short timeframe to address all the concerns raised today.

Dr. Diethelm reiterated the Board's choices are either tabling the issue for review in September or approval subject to the Board's approval of an implementation plan as discussed. Ms.

Mancuso stated that if the standards are approved as is with a two-year implementation plan, pending the Department returning to the Board with an improved implementation plan, they could incorporate many of the issues addressed today and would be better equipped to do that by September. Ms. Mancuso noted her concern about returning in September as the Board may not be in a better position to approve then since a two-year implementation plan would be pending.

Ms. Mancuso added that some of the improvements suggested today could be part of the pilot/revision, which could be presented to the Board at a later date. Ms. Owen asked if the pilot could be done as a next step as she does not see a reason to rush. Ms. Basha stated that she is having trouble following the logic in proceeding with a matter that is not accepted in the field.

Ms. Mendoza wondered if this could be adopted as a draft and whether the pilot schools could be Board approved.

Mr. Horne suggested that the language could be changed to stipulate that this is being approved as a draft and that the Department will provide a pilot for Board approval. Ms. Hilde noted that since the Board doesn't meet in July, August would be too late to allow schools to implement this in the Fall, so she would almost not include approving the pilot in the motion but rather stipulate that the pilots need to be reflective of Arizona, i.e., rural, urban, etc.

Ms. Mancuso compared the adoption of the early childhood standards that were sent out to the field for a year's worth of use/exposure with the expectation of getting feedback after that year to the early childhood standards committee. Mr. Basha responded that the Board adopted the early childhood rules as a statement and added that there is no mechanism in the field for this.

Ms. Janice Palmer, Director, Governmental Relations, Arizona School Boards Association, stated that a pilot status creates a concern for the ASBA. She noted that this is a statewide standard for Social Studies to be implemented. Regarding a pilot program, Ms. Palmer asked which schools would be chosen and who is going to pay for the process to take place? She stated that it will be more helpful to look at an implementation schedule for the entire state.

Dr. Diethelm reiterated that there is a motion on floor that could be changed to state that the

Board will accept the presented standards as draft standards. He added that there is opportunity to amend that motion.

Ms. Hilde noted that this appears to be two different directions and expressed the Board's gratitude for the extensive work done by the committee. Ms. Hilde emphasized that a motion to table until September does not wipe away the appreciation for the committee's work.

Motion by Dr. Pedicone to table approval until September 2005 State Board meeting to get more information about the response to the concerns expressed by the Board members including exposure, implementation plan, development of curriculum, servicing, training as well as a definition of prescriptive direction for teachers and administrators. Dr. Diethelm reiterated the motion as follows: Table the approval until the September 2005 State Board meeting at which time the Board will review a two-year implementation plan and revisions as appropriate to questions raised by the Board on implementation, buy-in and content. Seconded by Ms. Basha. *Motion passes.*

The Board took a lunch break at 1:00PM and reconvened at 1:20PM with Item 5A.

M. Presentation and Discussion Regarding the Two Year Results of the Reading First Initiative as Authorized by The No Child Left Behind Act

Ms. Marie Mancuso, Deputy Associate Superintendent, Standards Based Teaching and Learning, School Effectiveness Division, Arizona Department of Education presented the background and highlights from the four grade levels that have been collected and monitored. Please see the PowerPoint presentation provided in the materials packet.

Ms. Mancuso noted that Dr. Carrie Hancock, Director of K-3 Reading Assessment, ADE, helped prepare this report and Dr. Wendy Wolfersteig, Arizona Prevention Resource Center which serves as the external evaluator, was present. Ms. Mancuso noted that 80% of the funding received goes to high poverty/low reading achievement schools and that we have seventy-two schools in the Reading First program sixty-three of which have been in the program for two years. She commented that the data is preliminary findings based on the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS). This is a comparison of data from year one vs. year two.

Dr. Nicodemus asked about the difference between two cohorts and Ms. Mancuso responded that the cohort schools are the nine schools added this year and their data has been separated out.

Ms. Mancuso presented information regarding kindergarten, first, second and third grades noting that a large percentage of schools were able to move.

Ms. Kramer asked how our data compares with that of other states and Ms. Mancuso responded that Arizona was one of the first of six states to receive reading first funds and that Arizona is in the first cohort group.

Ms. Schwartz added that the plan developed is one of two that is being used as a model and that the work done by Ms. Mancuso has national recognition.

N. Presentation, Discussion and Consideration to Approve Proposed Changes to the School Evaluation System Under No Child Left Behind

Dr. Robert Franciosi, Deputy Associate Superintendent, Research and Evaluation Section, Arizona Department of Education, presented background information as provided in the materials packet.

Ms. Hilde asked what the impact is from going to 94% to 90% and Dr. Franciosi responded that the impact is probably about two-thirds that would make the indicator. Further discussion ensued for clarification of some of the information presented. Dr. Pedicone asked about the definition of small school and Dr. Franciosi explained that a school has to have an ADM of less than 100 and more than one-third of your subject grades have to have less than the minimum end count which for AYP is 30 students.

Motion by Ms. Hilde to approve the proposed changes to the School Evaluation System under No Child Left Behind as presented. Seconded by Dr. Pedicone, *Motion passes.*

O. Presentation and Discussion of Proposed Modification to The AZ LEARNS School Classification Formula

Dr. Pedicone suggested that this item be postponed due to the late hour and the length of the presentation. Superintendent Horne suggested postponing to a study session in early August.

6. Motion to adjourn by Ms. Hilde. Seconded by Ms. Owen. *Meeting adjourned at 5:05PM.*